08138.dd.59

ALFRED UNMASKED:

OR,

THE NEW CATALINE.

Intended as a Pair of SPECTACLES for the Short-sighted POLITICIANS of 1789.

The Minister has too much *Modesty*, or too little *Courage*, to proceed to the Point of Duty.

ALFRED, 3d. edit. p. 10.

PER CONTRA.

Neq; enim Catalina is es, ut te aut *Pudor* a Turpitudine, aut *Metus* a Periculo, aut Ratio a Furore revocârit.

Ciceronis in Catalinam Or. I.

LONDON:
Printed for R. FAULDER, New Bond-Street.

M,DCC,LXXXIX.

BRITISH MUSEUM
3 32
JUL

ALFRED UNMASKED:

OR,

THE NEW CATALINE.

A PAMPHLET under the reſpectable title of ALFRED having lately occupied much of the public attention, I was induced, by the encomiums with which many perſons of very accurate judgment recommended it to my peruſal, to ſend for it to my bookſeller.

Upon opening the book, my caution was awakened by a ſet of poſitions which

were intended to be adopted by the reader as axioms upon which he was to ground his examination of the propoſitions which might afterwards be adduced in ſupport of Mr. Withers's political opinions. I perceived that the author had been uſed boldly to bring forward a ſtring of aſſertions, and, without even pauſing for a reply, to build his ſuperſtructure upon their baſis. I have termed theſe ſplenetic effuſions, the political opinions of Mr. Withers, becauſe he appears to be the oſtenſible perſon. I confeſs, however, that I conſider Mr. Withers in the light of the Carian ſoldier, in the days of Rome, who having nothing at ſtake, nor any intereſt in the cauſe, brandiſhed his venal weapon for hire, againſt the enemies of his employers.

If the writer of the pamphlet ſees into the motives which influence Mr. Pitt's preſent political conduct, and yet dares to call him a patriot, I ſhall not heſitate to pronounce him a Knave. If he really believes Mr. Pitt's

Pitt's intentions to be honeſt, and his plans beneficial, I truſt and moſt ſincerely believe that time will prove him to be a Fool.

Let him not enumerate amongſt the bleſſed effects of Mr. Pitt's adminiſtration the preſent glory and happineſs of the realm. Our glory is tarniſhed, we are degraded by a patient ſubmiſſion to the cold and marked neglect with which ſome of the moſt gallant of our naval officers have been moſt unworthily branded. There has been a long ceſſation of war without the abolition of a ſingle burthen upon the people. The interiour trade of the kingdom has been oppreſſed by a moſt unequal ſhop-tax; and, with regard to our more extended commerce, the receipts of the cuſtoms inward being increaſed, will, I am afraid, be found but a futile argument to prove the advantages to be on our ſide. Mr. Pitt has been much praiſed for the exertions by which he maintained the dignity

and glory of this realm, during the commotions in the United Provinces. But would ſuch exertions have been made without the interference of Lord Malmſbury? It is now well known how difficult that able ſtateſman found it to rouſe the apathy of the deſpondent miniſter. How much his preſent conduct regards the happineſs of Great-Britain, we may collect from the diſſenſions which have been ſpread through our councils, the diſtruſt of the Heir Apparent which has ſo anxiouſly been diſſeminated throughout the nation—a diſtruſt of a perſonage who is now appointed to execute the laws of Great-Britain, and will in future time ſtretch forth the vigorous arm of unfettered authority; who will preſerve with dutiful anxiety that balance of the Conſtitution which the wiſdom of our anceſtors has given him weight in the great ſcale of government to accompliſh. Mr. Pitt's conduct has aimed at the diſunion of a mother and her children: it has been calculated to impreſs foreign

reign nations with an idea that the princes of the royal blood were not thought worthy of the care of his Majeſty's perſon, to inſinuate that a *puppet with a key at his pocket, and an automaton with a white ſtick in his hand,* were preferred to princes; that their attentions would be more cordial than thoſe of a brother and a ſon—A ſon who in time to come will ſhew the admiring world that, in the adornments of his mind and the diſpoſition of his feelings, he is a King,

"Ay, every inch a King."

The author obſerves, "Were it conſiſtent with the ſyſtem of policy, termed the Conſtitution, for the people to control the ſupreme magiſtrate in the choice of his miniſters, his highneſs would be ſoon informed, in whom alone they can repoſe with confidence, the protection of life, privilege and property."

Remark. The *minority* of the city-meeting, which, under the illuſtrious banners of Mr. Beachcroft,

Beachcroft, ſigned an addreſs of thanks to Mr. Pitt, purporting to be the act of the *majority*, might poſſibly dignify Mr. Pitt with ſo creditable a recommendation. Like the Parthians, they aimed a dart at their foes, even while themſelves were running away.

"Verſis animoſi equis." HOR.

But no man dare ſay (unleſs perhaps a paradoxical prelate of the preſent day, under the patronage of Mr. Pitt), that the opinion of three againſt five (for ſuch was the proportion) can be ſtyled the ſenſe of the citizens of London.

Again, the miniſter is charged with too much *modeſty* to proceed to the point of duty. If his preſent conduct is to be deemed *modeſt*, it is a modification of the virtue which our more liberal neighbours diſtinguiſh by the title of, a *modeſt aſſurance*: the modeſty of Mr. Pitt and his panegyriſt ſeem to be exactly on a parallel. Mr. Pitt's

entrance into politics ſtamps a diſgrace upon him as a man, which no after conduct can do away. Indeed *(another inſtance of his modeſty)* he ſeems little conſcious of the mean and grovelling ſtealth by which he crept into power; and years ſeem ſo little to have improved his feelings, that, though he is "Capellatior quam ante & barbâ majore," he is deſirous of marking his exit with the ſame black characters which rendered his entrance infamous.

"And when he falls, he falls like Lucifer,
Never to riſe again." SHAKESPEAR.

Power originates with the people. ALFRED.

If the writer of the pamphlet recurs to firſt principles in this poſition, it is granted. The people of England formed themſelves originally into three eſtates; one of which conſiſted of a ſingle perſonage, entruſted with very ſingular powers and privileges. In the courſe of our hiſtory, we have many inſtances, on account either of

of failure of blood, or for ſome other reaſon, which at the ſeveral times appeared a ſufficient ground for ſuch proceedings, of acts for limiting the ſucceſſion of the crown. Under the lateſt act of limitations, *the Houſe of Hanover* is now in poſſeſſion of the throne; till *the Houſe of Hanover* fails, no other can intrude upon its inheritance. To *the Houſe of Hanover* we have ſworn allegiance. To whom then can we delegate the ſovereign powers, but to *the Houſe of Hanover*—to the *Prince of Wales*, the head of that Houſe? I have never underſtood that her majeſty, greatly as I have hitherto reſpected her, was at all regarded in this limitation of deſcent; that the Houſe of Hanover acknowledged her for one of its illuſtrious branches; or that any poſſible contingency (under the act above alluded to) can ever place her majeſty upon the Britiſh throne. I ſhall only add from Tacitus, "Quouſque filium imperatoris obſidebimus? quis certaminum finis? Percennione & Vibuleno ſacramentum dicturi ſumus? Percennius

Percennius & Vibulenus ſtipendia militibus, agros emeritis largientur? Denique pro Neronibus & Druſis imperium populi Romani capeſſent?"

The man who, without a ſtruggle to oppoſe it, can bend ſubmiſſively to the undue influence of this fourth eſtate, is, in my opinion, a traitor, and diſclaims his allegiance to the Houſe of Hanover.

By ſubmitting the queſtion of Right to Parliament, Mr. Pitt has acted in a moſt unparliamentary manner; an expreſſion which dropped from an individual in the Houſe of Commons, was the pretended ground of this diſcuſſion. Was the private ſentiment of an individual a ſufficient authority for parliamentary proceedings, upon a queſtion, the determination of which could not poſſibly produce any benefit to the conſtitution, but which might probably be fraught with much miſchief? I ſay, the diſcuſſion of the queſtion could not be be-

neficial, becauſe the claim had been renounced on the behalf of the only perſonage in theſe kingdoms, whoſe opinions could authoriſe a parliamentary inquiry, by a higher authority than that upon which Mr. Pitt thought proper to proceed.

The once illuſtrious leader of the oppoſition is ſtill ſuperior to the malicious blow aimed at his name by a weak opponent, who, conſcious how few there are who will take the trouble critically to examine his poſitions, ſubſtitutes ſophiſtry for argument, and virulent abuſe for the noble fervency of a *Patriot*. *Mr. Fox* never has deſerted his former principles; the ſpirit of the *Conſtitution* is equally indignant at the unneceſſary depreſſion of any of its component parts. To preſerve the juſt balance of the *Conſtitution*, and keep alive the jealouſy which ought always to ſubſiſt between its ſeveral members, is a conduct worthy the exalted character of a *Patriot*. Whoever ſteps beyond the juſt bounds, either in the augmentation

tation or depreſſion of any one faculty of the *Conſtitution*, is a *robber*, an *incendiary*, and a *cordial foe* to the intereſts of his country.

At a time when the influence of the Crown was overflowing the banks of that channel which the prudent wiſdom of our anceſtors had traced out for the current, *Mr. Fox*, with the moſt independent and ſpirited remonſtrances, ſtemmed the ambitious torrent, and counteracted its menaced ravages. In this inſtance he ſupported the people againſt the encroachments of the Crown.

Again, when the ambitious projects and deſpicable ſuſpicions of the preſent miniſter aimed a blow, equally fatal to the welfare of the general frame of government, at thoſe privileges with which antient wiſdom had decked the majeſty of the executive government, the ſame anxious and untired patriot ſtretched forth his hand in ſupport of the original object of his protection, the whole fabric of the Conſtitution. The craft

of malice was undermining the baſis of that ſtructure, in which are depoſited our deareſt hopes. The official dignity of the *Monarch* was inſulted in the perſon of *the Heir Apparent*, at a time when the father lay under a grievous affliction from the hand of the Almighty; when the ſon of our much regretted monarch was unable, through the hourly procraſtination of his father's confidential ſervants, to protect his father's inſulted prerogative.

The *Parliament* *, and not alone the Commons, was the object of his former affection. The *Parliament*, and not the Monarch only, is now the object of his deareſt cares, of his moſt loyal protection.

By reſorting to a fiction, we tacitly admit, that power deſcends from the throne to the people, inſtead of the converſe of the mode, from the people to the throne. ALFRED.

* By the word Parliament I mean the conjunction of the three eſtates; the King, the Lords, and the Commons.

Honours

Honours do deſcend from the throne to the people: The crown is the fountain of honour—I find no difficulty in allowing, that *Power* is originally veſted in the throne by the people; ſuch has been the conſent of the people of Great-Britain. Why then deſtroy thoſe valuable inſtitutions of government, which the temperate conſideration and long experience of ages has approved? Why then inſult, in a defenceleſs hour, the memory of the father's greatneſs in the perſon of his ſon? Men, who harp thus upon the ſame diſcordant ſtring, a ſtring in harmony with no one note of cool and equal reaſon, neither in uniſon with any one feeling of humanity; while the more enlightened look back with reverence and gratitude on the wholeſome regulations of former ages, ſeem to be diſcontented with the powers ſo delegated by our anceſtors to the monarch. If ſuch be Mr. Pitt's opinions, if a reformation of our antient ſyſtem of policy be the ſcope of his ambition, let him ſpeak out like a man; not like a

ſly

ſly aſſaſſin, ſteal in upon the hour of our ſecurity, and, with a ſavage joy and brutal exultation, inflict the blow fatal to the exiſtence of our much envied conſtitution. Would he be a man even in his enormities, we ſhould at leaſt know how alone we were to oppoſe him.—

"*To your tents, O Iſrael.*"

The confidential ſervants of the executive authority are open to impeachment, whether that authority is veſted in a king or a regent.

The writer of the pamphlet, in his contradiction of this poſition, has unwarily confeſſed the injuſtice which is exerciſed againſt the Prince of Wales. The Prince he has ſtated as himſelf a reſponſible perſon. But have we ever, in the annals of our hiſtory, heard of reſponſibility, without powers or patronage? We have indeed, at preſent, a melancholy precedent for future ages, of the

the converſe of this hypotheſis, in the Queen and her council, of powers and patronage without reſponſibility.

As to a diſtruſt of the *Prince Regent's* confidential ſervants, what man can be preſumptuous enough to ſtate that as a ground for theſe illiberal reſtrictions, when *ſuſpicion* only can ſuggeſt who thoſe ſervants are to be? And even ſuppoſing theſe ſuſpicions to be well founded, will any dare to impeach the illuſtrious names of *Portland*, *Cavendiſh*, and *Wentworth Fitzwilliam*?

If we look a little forward we ſhall find the plot diſcovered by an inadvertent expreſſion of this champion of our immaculate miniſter, "It reſts," he ſays, "with the patriotiſm of Mr. Pitt, to crown his glorious atchievements by full and effectual reſtrictions. Let him be cautious, and in manly contempt of print-ſhops, pamphlets and proſtitute publications, keep the reins * till the

* The 3d edition (whether it is an emendation or an erratum I know not) reads reigns.

King

King and people are ſecure." A large latitude of interpretation the writer ſeems to have made uſe of; a like latitude he cannot deny us. To uſe his own quotation, "*Hanc veniam petimuſq; damuſq; viciſſim.*"

The former and preſent political opinions of Mr. Fox, and a noble Lord in the Blue Ribbon, are next ſtated with a malicious partiality, and a moſt uncandid fallacy. Let it be remembered, that the cauſe of their contention is now no more. As the Author is fond of logical poſitions, let him remember that "*Sublatâ cauſâ tollitur effectus.*" It was a ſingle point of difference which ſo long deprived themſelves of the ſatisfaction, and their country of the benefit, of their coalition. That point is now finally determined. It ſurely then argued a noble-minded forgiveneſs, a ſoul ſuperior to the vulgar prejudices of the "lily-liver'd wretches" he now contends with, to forget his former animoſities, and to abhor the laſting inveteracy of cool-blooded malice; when a co-

operation of his ſplendid talents with thoſe of his illuſtrious colleague, was neceſſary to oppoſe the "raviſhing ſtrides," which were bearing on an ambitious faction, to the mutilation, or perhaps the final deſtruction, of our Government.

It is next inquired, "Under what order of ſtateſmen are thoſe men to be claſſed, who are in equal oppoſition to the prerogatives of the Sovereign, and the privileges of the people? Let him ſtate the queſtion now fairly, "Under what order of ſtateſmen are they to be claſſed, who are in equal oppoſition to the encroachments of the Crown, and the tumults of democratical rebellion?" Mr. Fox, on whom the writer calls for an anſwer, would, I am perſuaded, give an obvious one: He would call them *patriots*.

As to the prayer for his Majeſty's recovery, let the learned and pious prelates ſettle among themſelves. I ſuppoſe a prayer is neceſſary for the forms of etiquette. But

if my own private opinion were aſked, I ſhould ſay, that if it be neceſſary for the eternal plans of the almighty Diſpoſer of events to continue this affliction, no prayers of ours can reverſe the decree. And it would have recommended Mr. Withers more to a ſociety of Chriſtians, than his frequent reflections on his Sovereign ſo diſgraceful to the feelings of human nature, to have wiſhed that, when it ſhould pleaſe God to remove our Monarch from a life ſo painful, his ſoul might be waſhed clean, and his ſins be expiated by his worldly ſufferings.

It does not a little degrade the writer of Alfred in my opinion, that he comes forward profeſſedly the admirer and protector of a man (I do not in this inſtance mean Mr. Pitt) whoſe name the public voice has ever ſince the time of Junius conſigned to infamy: A man who has riſen through every degree of contempt, till he has at length arrived at the dignity of being hated:

One

One who is ſingled out from the common herd of miſcreants, as a wretch, to uſe the expreſſive language of Cicero, "flagitiis & ſceleribus contaminatiſſimus."

The letters to the Prince of Wales and Mrs. Fitzherbert preſent themſelves next to our obſervation. I conclude them to have been written with the ſame pure and diſintereſted motives, which influenced Mr. *Rolle*'s conduct on a ſimilar occaſion. He had no doubts of his own—not he—*he*, honeſt man, brought forward the matter merely to ſerve the Prince, by removing the ſuſpicions of others. Or perhaps he was commanded to introduce it, that Mr. *Pitt* might have an opportunity of diſplaying his candour and ingenuouſneſs upon a ſubject, which he was conſcious the Houſe of Commons could not diſcuſs without a palpable abſurdity. An act of the firſt of William and Mary is quoted upon the ſubject, Read the ſtatutes, Mr. Withers, and

you will find that the act you allude to is now as inefficient as the refcripts of Juſtinian, or the edicts of the Emperor of China. The ſtatute of the firſt of William and Mary limits the ſucceſſion of the Crown to the immediate iſſue of King William the Third; under which limitation the Prince of Wales cannot inherit. That ſtatute, therefore, can never influence his conduct. But the abſurdity which I affirmed would have ariſen from Mr. Rolle's motion being carried, ariſes from *an act of the preſent reign*, which declares the union of a Prince of Wales with a Papiſt to be *ipſo facto* null and void, and that no ceremony whatever can render it a marriage. How then can Parliament inquire into the exiſtence of a meaſure, which itſelf has declared cannot in the nature of things exiſt? But I refer the reader to Mr. Courtney's ſpeech, to ſet this buſineſs in its true light, and make it as ridiculous as it deſerves. The fact has been denied by greater authority, than the contemptible

ipſe dixit of Mr. Tooke. Well may Mr. Fox ſay with Ajax,

" Et mecum confertur Ulyſſes ?"

The next thing our underſtandings are inſulted with, is what the Author calls a ſtate of facts, an infamous and libellous production, evidently vamped up to ſwell the book, and, by a ſtring of what I moſt ſincerely believe to be the moſt barefaced *lies*, to attract the attention of thoſe who have no better employment than to read them.

The Author relies upon newſpapers for the names of the Prince Regent's political adviſers. Whether his intelligence is or is not authentic, it is not for me to pronounce. But to meet him on his own ground, let us conſider them.

It would be preſumptuous in me to attempt to illuſtrate the exalted qualities of *his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales*. His *forbearance* and *temper* place him much

above all praiſe. The propriety of his conduct has made him the *general* object of the moſt heartfelt panegyric.

His Royal Highneſs the Duke of York has nobly ſtood forward in the ſupport of his *father*'s prerogative, and of his brother's honours. His profeſſional knowledge has recommended him to the friendſhip of the *Emperor of Germany*, and the *King of Pruſſia*,

The reflections upon the zeal and loyalty of *his Royal Highneſs the Duke of Cumberland* deſerve rather the chaſtiſement of a cudgel, than the reprehenſions of a gentleman.

We are next ſtruck with an addreſs to *his Majeſty*, praying him to remove *John Earl of Sandwich* from the office of Firſt Lord Commiſſioner of the Admiralty. The charge is *neglect of duty*, or *incapacity*. It is ſigned, *Portland*, *Fitzwilliam*.

I agree

I agree with Mr. Withers, or his maſter, or any perſon who may have made the obſervation, that nothing is more valuable in controverſy than *obvious facts*. There is an *obvious fact*, which he ſeems to have diſregarded, at the head of this motion. I mean the date 23d April, 1779; a date which reminds us of the moſt diſturbed debates in the annals of the American war. The conduct of the Admiralty was the office of which Lord Sandwich was then by the proteſtors thought incapable. To that office I hear no rumour of an intention to promote him. As I have before ſaid reſpecting Mr. *Fox* and Lord *North*, the point of diſſenſion is now finally ſettled. The abilities of the noble Earl may be uſeful to his country perhaps in another department. But if the noble Earl ſhould be placed in no oſtenſible ſituation, let the Author recollect, that no man in this country muſt be called the adviſer of a public meaſure, who is not made reſponſible for the conſequences of his advice. If then the gentleman who has

culled

culled this choice flower from the garden of Parliamentary Hiſtory, can reduce the events of that critical period and the proſpect which now lies before us to one and the ſame general principle, then, and then only, will I agree, that *his Grace the Duke of Portland*, and *Earl Fitzwilliam* are now inconſiſtent in their conferences with *Lord Sandwich*.

Lord *North*.—No man will be bold enough to deny the noble Lord in the Blue Ribbon the title of the moſt able financier this country ever ſaw—A title which ſome *obvious facts* preclude Mr. *Pitt* from the poſſibility of claiming.

Mr. *Burke* and Mr. *Fox*.—Enough has been already ſaid in ſupport of the truly liberal principles which dictated the coalition. But let them put the worſt conſtruction upon it, it was a conſummation *at leaſt* as conſiſtent as the union of his ******* with the writer of the *forty-fifth* number of the *North Briton*.

Mr.

Mr. *Sheridan*'s ſuperlatively ſplendid abilities

"Smile
"At the drawn dagger and defy its point."

Lord *Stormont*.—A man of uncommon intelligence in a foreign Court, of great political experience, and very converſant in the hiſtories and conſtitutions of this and other ſtates; whoſe abilities and exertions qualify him even for the laborious office of Secretary of State. A nobleman who, bravely patriotic, dared ſtep forward, and ſpurn the infringements of the *articles of the union*.

Lord *Loughborough*.—As to the obſervation on this nobleman, when the *Heir Apparent* and *the Princes of the Royal Blood* could not eſcape the venom, why ſhould we expect that the great Judges of the realm ſhould be ſecure from the attack? But it was not the principle of the author's party to ſhew any reſpect or reverence to the Judges. It would have done honour

to Mr. Pitt, and even to the Houſe of Lords, if the opinion of the Twelve Judges had been taken on a matter ſo eſſential to the Conſtitution, and which was of ſo nice a nature as to involve points of law, which none were equal to, but thoſe who, from a long education and practice in thoſe laws, were well read in the firſt principles of the Conſtitution, and whoſe integrity had ever remained unſullied. There is not a candid man in the kingdom who would not have acquieſced in the ſolemn opinion of the Judges. As to the Chief Juſtice in queſtion, his abilities, his knowledge, not ſingly in the law, but in hiſtory, and every branch of polite literature, ſtand ſo high in the eſtimation of mankind, that I ſcarcely know his equal: and as to his political abilities, they have ſhone ſo reſplendently in both Houſes of Parliament, that there is not a ſingle antagoniſt who has not felt the weight of his oratory, and the force of his reaſoning.

Lord

Lord *Southampton.*—The *only* objection which has been ſtarted againſt this noble Lord, will hold equally good againſt more than one half of *her Majeſty*'s very intelligent council.

Sir *Thomas Dundas.*—His influence over the hearts as well as the underſtandings of the people of Scotland, unaided by the petiteſſe, the low craft, and deſpicable contrivances of his nameſake, render Sir *Thomas Dundas* a moſt reſpected and deſirable ally.

Our attention is next called to the antagoniſts of theſe great characters—among the names which follow we deſiderate many whom we might naturally have expected to have found enrolled in this illuſtrious catalogue of worthies. In vain we look for the Duke of Richmond, Lord Hawkeſbury and Mr. Eden. They ſhrink from the ordeal of candid and impartial examination,

and ſkulk from the light which *Truth* was prepared to throw upon them.

The preſent ſtate of this country argues weakneſs in *Mr. Pitt*'s head, and depravity in his heart. He has done that by Parliaments which Hanno once charged Hannibal with attempting by armies. I will call him " Juvenem flagrantem cupidine regni, viamque unam ad id cernentem." He, long under the maſk of diſſimulation, concealed his views. He has been long raking up the embers of faction, till at length he found one ſpark of fire; that one ſpark, with the aſſiſtance of idiots, and the connivance of villains, he has blown into a flame, which, but for the bold torrent of oppoſition, had laid in aſhes the fabric of our government. He has drawn the ſword, and thrown away the ſcabbard; and, unveiling at once his baſeneſs to the aſtoniſhed world, " non patitur lentas ſcelerum moras & crimina operoſa & nequitiæ ambages, ſed præcipiti quodam itinere & flagitii compendio utitur."

Lord

Lord Thurlow is the only counſellor whoſe influence has marked the acts of Mr. Pitt's adminiſtration with tolerable reſpectability. His head has been diſtinguiſhed by manly ſenſe, and his heart, in any inſtance where the public has had an opportunity of eſtimating it, by ſtubborn integrity. I am perſuaded that he nauſeates the *ſervile civility* with which his name has been introduced into a certain commiſſion as *Edward Lord Thurlow*, inſtead of the *Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain.* It was a degradation to the firſt official character in the kingdom to ſacrifice it at the ſhrine of a private man. We wonder much at ſeeing a character like Lord Thurlow diſgrace, as it ſhould ſeem, his faculties, by an adherence to a party whoſe only ſupport is its uniform duplicity. Mr. Pitt's fineſſe cannot operate as a deception on Lord Thurlow's intellects. The only probable reaſon of this ſeeming contradiction muſt be, that he ſees the dangerous tendency of their plans, and endeavours to uſe his influence

ence over them, ſometimes as a preventative, and frequently as an antidote againſt the diſeaſes, the contagion of which the Miniſter, with the malignity of an infernal ſpirit, has ſtrove to ſpread through every fibre of the Conſtitution.

In the panegyrical part of the author's obſervations on Lord Thurlow, is introduced a blow, *en paſſant*, at thoſe who have oppoſed the idea of a fourth eſtate in the queen and her council. It is by far the moſt *candid* declaration which has been made in the whole work. Let us take his own words:

" If the people deſire to pay for the ſupport of the accidental prerogatives of an afflicted Sovereign, it is impertinent in the party to oppoſe their wiſhes:" But, " the prince is unwilling to impoſe freſh burdens on the country by a new eſtabliſhment. Speak out like men—*The patronage of the Houſehold will afford oppoſition to your views.*"

Here now is a plain, open, unequivocal avowal of an intention to ſet up the houſehold in oppoſition to the perſons, who are ſuppoſed to be the intended miniſters of the Prince Regent; a blind oppoſition to the government of the country, without knowing the meaſures they are to oppoſe. Here a new ſcene is opened to the public eye—the ſervants of the King are ſeen exerciſing the inveteracy of their malice againſt their maſter's ſon—and a moſt illiberal conſtruction is thrown upon the noble and ſpirited forbearance with which the Prince declined the proffered benevolence of his father's loyal people. The people of England are frequently apt to be miſled; but when the real truth is explained to them, they always are open to conviction. Let the *people of England* conſider this declaration, and they will think accordingly.

Lord Camden.—The verſatility of this man's opinions is not a little aſtoniſhing, even in the character of a *legal* ſtateſman—

He

He ſtarted a friend to liberty, and, in the cauſe of Mr. Wilkes, proved that he either knew not, or did not chooſe to ſee the difference between liberty and licentiouſneſs.—He ſoon found the emoluments of a court very congenial to his natural temper; and, when the happy moment arrived, he ſeized it with the avidity of a leech, but with this diſtinction, that I do not find he has ever yet been ſatiated. He has never dropped off, and ſtill wants a longer reſpite, leſt, when he ſhall be hurried to the grave, he ſhould not have riches enough left to pay the undertaker. But theſe are the failings of a mind once vigorous, but now enervated, and ſunk in fears and apprehenſions—yet he has been rouſed again into the flaſh of former times, and could not reſiſt the temptation that was afforded him, of altering the conſtitution from a monarchical to an almoſt republican government. The country owes him ſomething, like Manlius for defending the capitol, in the cauſe of general warrants; but it overpays his ſervices, if it ſhould reſign,

in

in compliment to his whims, our moſt excellent government, for one framed either by his Lordſhip in his *dotage*, or his Grace of Richmond in the *plenitude of his mental inſanity*.

Lords Carmarthen and Sydney are the laſt of this illuſtrious group. Of them I ſhall only ſay in the words of Sterne, *In God's name wipe it up, and ſay no more about it.*

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM
JUL 32